	Case 2:14-cv-00318-JAD-PAL Document 6 File	ed 04/24/14 Page 1 of 2
1		
2 3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
10	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
11		
12	Johannes Gabriel Badou Jack,	Case No.: 2:14-cv-318-JAD-PAL
13	Plaintiff,	
<ul><li>14</li><li>15</li></ul>	V.	Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion
16	Ringleader Boxing Management Company, LLC,	for Summary Judgment [Doc. 3]
17	Defendant.	
18	Plaintiff Johannes Gabriel Radou Jack a pro-	fassional hover brought this action for
19	Plaintiff Johannes Gabriel Badou Jack, a professional boxer, brought this action for declaratory and quasi-contractual relief against Defendant Ringleader Boxing Management	
20		
21		
22	Clerk of Court issued a Summons to Ringleader Boxing. Doc. 5. To date, the Summons has	
23	not been returned executed, and Ringleader Boxing has not answered or otherwise responded	
24	to either Jack's Complaint or Motion for Summary Judgment.	
<ul><li>25</li><li>26</li></ul>	Service of process is governed by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4, and until a	
27	summons is properly served on a party or service is otherwise waived, the Court cannot	
28		

## Case 2:14-cv-00318-JAD-PAL Document 6 Filed 04/24/14 Page 2 of 2

exercise personal jurisdiction over that party. Although the rule should liberally construed when a party has received sufficient notice that a complaint has been filed, "[n]either actual notice, nor simply naming the person in the caption of the complaint, will subject defendants to personal jurisdiction if service was not made in substantial compliance with Rule 4."<sup>2</sup> Without personal jurisdiction over a party, the Court lacks authority to dispose of a substantive allegation against that party. Jack moved for summary judgment against Ringleader before service of process had been completed, and there is no indication that any steps to comply with Rule 4 have been taken. Thus, the Court denies his motion for summary judgment as premature. 

## Conclusion

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment [Doc. 3] is **DENIED**.

DATED: April 24, 2014.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

<sup>1</sup> Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 4; *Benny v. Pipes*, 799 F.2d 489, 492 (9 th Cir. 1986). 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Crowley v. Bannister, 734 F.3d 967, 975 (9th Cir. 2013) (quoting Jackson v. Hayakawa, 682 F.2d 1344, 1347 (9th Cir. 1982) (citations omitted).